DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 332 981 SP 033 093

AUTHOR	Schlechty, Phillip C.
TITLE	Reform in Teacher Education: A Sociological View.
INSTITUTION	American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-89333-059-0
PUB DATE	Aug 90
NOTE	75p.
AVAILABLE FROM	American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 610, Washington, DC 20036-2412 ($18.00).
PUB TYPE	Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Change; Educational Sociology; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Liberal Arts; *Preservice Teacher Education; Professional Education; *Schools of Education; Selective Admission; *Student Recruitment; Systems Analysis; Teacher Education Curriculum; Teacher Education Programs; *Teaching (Occupation)
IDENTIFIERS	*Professional Guidelines; Sociology of Occupations; *Teacher Socialization

ABSTRACT

This monograph examines preservice teacher education from the perspective of the sociologist. It emphasizes the need for furthering the cause of professionalism among teachers through the acquisition of knowledge, skills, attitudes, beliefs, and orientations of a profession, a process referred to as a socialization system. The publication offers a statement of intent, along with three chapters which present a general description of socialization subsystems, discussing the important characteristics of each and detailing the implications for teacher education. Chapter 1 covers the recruitment and selection subsystem and includes criteria for recruitment, degree of selectivity, sponsorship, prior commitment, and implications for teacher education. Chapter 2 discusses the induction subsystem, covering the meaning of induction; conditions of admission; status systems; rituals, ceremonies, and celebrations; and implications for teacher education. Chapter 3, on the normative subsystem, discusses the nature and types of norms, characteristics of normative systems, the liberal arts academy or professional school, professional preparation programs, the issue of purpose, a common language, and performance visibility and intensity of communication. (LL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED332981

Reform

IN TEACHER EDUCATION

A SOCIOLOGICAL VIEW

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Imig

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP 023 093

By Phillip C. Schlechty

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Reform

IN TEACHER EDUCATION

A SOCIOLOGICAL VIEW

By Phillip C. Schlechty
President
The Center for Leadership in School Reform
Louisville, Kentucky

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
August, 1990

The opinions, conclusions, and recommendations expressed in this monograph do not necessarily reflect the views or opinions of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. The AACTE does not endorse or warrant this information. The AACTE is publishing this document to stimulate discussion, study, and experimentation among educators. The author was encouraged to express his judgment freely. The reader must evaluate this information in light of the unique circumstances of any particular situation and must determine independently the applicability of this information thereto.

Copies of
Reform in Teacher Education: A Sociological View
may be ordered from:
AACTE Publications
One Dupont Circle, Suite 610
Washington, DC 20036-2412

Single copy (prepaid) $18.00

Copyright 1990 by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

All rights reserved

Printed in the United States of America

Library of Congress Catalog Number: 89-80021

International Standard Book Number: 0-89333-059-0

CONTENTS

Foreword v

Introduction: A Statement of Intent 1
- Some Preliminary Observations 1
- An Unconventional View of Conventional Issues 2
- A Theoretical Perspective 3
- Organization of Monograph 4

Chapter I: The Recruitment and Selection Subsystem 5
- Criteria for Recruitment 6
- Implications for Teacher Education 8
- Degree of Selectivity 11
- Implications for Teacher Education 14
- Sponsorship 17
- Implications for Teacher Education 18
- Prior Commitment 20
- Implications for Teacher Education 22
- A Concluding Remark 25

Chapter II: The Induction Subsystem 27
- The Meaning of Induction 28
- Conditions of Admission 30
- Implications for Teacher Education 31
- Status Systems 33
- Implications for Teacher Education 34
- Rituals, Ceremonies, and Celebrations 36
- Implications for Teacher Education 38

Chapter III: The Normative Subsystem 39
On the Nature of Norms 39
Types of Norms 40
Characteristics of Normative Systems 41
Implications for Teacher Education 42
The Dilemma: Liberal Arts Academy or Professional School . . . 48
Professional Preparation Programs 54
The Issue of Purpose 54
Implications for Teacher Education 55
A Common Language 56
Implications for Teacher Education 58
Performance Visibility and Intensity of Communication 60
Implications for Teacher Education 62

Bibliography 65

FOREWORD

I confess to being a real fan of Phil Schlechty. He has (justly, I think) acquired the reputation of being the "compleat iconoclast"—a person who over the years has challenged any and all established beliefs and values, particularly those held by teacher educators. Iconoclasts are almost always interesting people, but usually they are not easy to be around. Not so with Schlechty. He is an energetic, popular speaker who holds our highest values and beliefs up to scrutiny and criticism without making enemies. Simultaneously, he is critic and friendly Dutch uncle.

This current work reveals both these tendencies about a topic much on our lips, less on our minds, and seldom on our agendas: teacher education reform. Schlechty the iconoclast tells us we may be talking about the wrong things and he suggests constructive ways that we might help teacher education get on track.

I have several comments on this book, beginning with an anecdote. I am often asked to speak with groups about teacher education reform. Always I start these talks with one of my favorite quotes from a piece that David Clark wrote about the structure of teacher education.

> The charm that teacher education held earlier in this century as the route to the professions for the common person has become its fatal weakness. It is easily accessible in every sense of that term: geographically proximate to the consumer, easy to enter, short in duration, optimally convenient to the remainder of the college student's academic program, easy to complete, inexpensive, nonexclusive (i.e., does not rule out other career options), and, until very recently almost certain to result in placement in a secure, respectable professional situation. Teacher education has become everyman. (1984, 118)

During each of my presentations someone in the audience has challenged Clark's view that teacher education has a fatal illness; namely, that it is

weak and vacillating in the requirements it establishes for entry, in its programs of instruction, and in the contributions it makes toward building a strong profession. The audience commentators usually note the following obstacles to reform.

- While high entry standards are desirable in the abstract, a severe teacher shortage currently exists and we need to have "appropriate" standards because supply will dry up otherwise.
- Easy access into teacher education programs provides upward mobility for first-generation college-going daughters and sons of working-class families. This is an important societal function, which should be honored rather than shamed.
- We need to recognize that teaching is different from those professions that demand an exclusive commitment from their novitiates.

The discussions following these comments are usually spirited. I tend to respond along historical lines with some sociological coloration. As Tyack and others have noted, I reply, teaching as an occupation in the United States has traditionally been held in low regard. During most of our history as a nation, teachers have been recruited from groups that traditionally were less well educated; they have been paid a low wage (at or below the poverty level), subjected to considerable social and political pressure, and allowed little if any job security. Basically, teaching has been built on the blocked career aspirations of women and, to a much lesser extent, minorities. To quote Tyack, America has probably had "better teachers than it had any right to expect, when one considers their pay and conditions of work." (1967, 412)

In the last 50 years, I continue, we have seen some alteration in this pattern. Although it was not always apparent, there has been a strong movement toward better education and training for teachers. This has been reflected in pay and conditions of work, so that the profession is no

longer as closely associated with poverty, insecurity, and careful supervision of the social and political lives of teachers.

While things have improved for teachers and in teacher education, I point out, the historical developmental process is now at a critical juncture. Teaching and teacher education have made considerable progress but much more is needed, and the current reform atmosphere provides a window of opportunity for change. I stress our need to push the next cycle of changes through that window before it is slammed shut, changes that must address the structural issues Clark raised.

My arguments fall on deaf ears. The audience departs unconvinced and sometimes angry.

In this book Phil Schlechty tackles these same issues more successfully. From the unconventional perspective of the sociologist, he examines the conventions of teacher education. (What else could a self-respecting iconoclast do?) He notes what I think is a fact of life, that we probably spend more time than necessary thinking about what we should teach to prospective teachers and too little time thinking about their characteristics and assimilation into a professional culture. In the main body of this text, Schlechty reviews sociological literature as it contributes to understanding three important subsystems in teacher education: recruitment and selection, induction, and norms. And in each section he discusses the implications of his views for teacher education.

In discussing the recruitment and selection subsystem, for example, Schlechty notes the general belief among sociologists that "... one of the major barriers to the emergence of teaching as a profession is a lack of a distinctive occupational substructure and a clear occupational identity." Development and articulation of specific and clear criteria for both recruitment and selection of prospective teachers, he argues, would contribute to creating a professional identity. Why? Recruiting and selecting strong candidates into teacher education, even with an impending short-

age of teachers, will send a message that teacher educators have a clear vision of the image they want teachers to carry, that a warm body is not a sufficient criterion to enter teacher education programs, and that appropriate and higher entry standards are consistent with the demands for improved education for youngsters in the United States.

I contend that teacher educators know this subsystem needs considerable attention; it's the area we, among all the people in the world, can do something about because we usually have direct control over this aspect of our programs. Making a conscious effort to be more selective about who enters our programs would benefit K–12 schools, and thus garner respect for us and our programs. But more importantly for the cause of professionalism, higher entry standards, clearly articulated, would enhance teaching by demonstrating that it is a selective occupation.

Schlechty's ideas in the other areas are equally powerful, and generally his points are telling. As professionals, we in teacher education have paid precious little attention to the sociological subsystems he analyzes. His basic point is that we would further the cause of professionalism by attending to them. I agree.

One final note: That window of opportunity now open for teacher educators is closing fast. If we as a group want to continue to be employed, we must stop our typical handwringing and our persistent tendency to look to current practice and current rationale as guidelines to the future. Schlechty's book can help us do this.

WILLIAM E. GARDNER
DEAN, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

INTRODUCTION: A STATEMENT OF INTENT

The survival of any group requires that new members acquire the knowledge, skills, attitudes, beliefs, and orientations that are necessary to fulfill the roles assigned in the group. The processes, procedures, and activities associated with acquiring group-relevant knowledge are commonly referred to as *socialization processes*. The processes associated with acquiring the knowledge, skills, attitudes, beliefs, and orientations required to fulfill occupational roles are called occupational socialization.

Properly conceived, teacher education, including what happens to teachers in their preservice programs, is a subset of a more comprehensive socialization system in which those who teach acquire the social knowledge and technical skills needed to work throughout their occupational lives. Although the discussion here will center on preservice programs, I believe, that much of this material could apply to beginning teacher programs, internships, and other forms of initial induction experiences in education.

Some Preliminary Observations

Given the assumption that teacher education is a subset of an occupational socialization system, the following observations can be made.

First, it makes little, if any, sense to make recommendations about reform in preservice teacher education or in the curriculum of teachers' colleges without relating these recommendations to the larger socialization system of which preservice education is a part. It is likely that many of the criticisms of preservice teacher education are attributable to decisions regarding how preservice education should be organized. These de-

cisions have been made without sufficient attention to the place of preservice teacher education in the overall process of teacher socialization.

Second, preservice teacher education, like other forms of socialization, has both intended and unintended consequences. The intended consequences are sometimes less significant to the real learning of teachers than are the unintended consequences. It is likely, for example, that requiring students to study educational theory for the intended purpose of assuring a sound theoretical framework from which to make pedagogical decisions has, in some cases, the unintended consequence of teaching students that theory is irrelevant to practice.

Third, the more obvious features of teacher education programs, like the more obvious features of other systems of socialization, are often less critical determinants of what is learned than are the less obvious features. For example, two more obvious features of a teacher education program are the length of time it takes to complete the program and the academic rigor of the program. Such features are important, but equally important is the way one gains entry into teacher education. Easy entry may teach the unintentional lesson that teacher education is not rigorous. Similarly, teacher educators are rightly concerned with the content and procedures used in supervising student teachers; however, teacher educators seem less aware that the frequency of interaction between supervisor and student teacher is at least as powerful a determinant of the effectiveness of supervision as are the skills and procedures used by the supervisor.

An Unconventional View of Conventional Issues

Viewing preservice teacher education from a socialization perspective causes one to look at many characteristics of teacher education programs that are often overlooked. For example, the manner in which persons are recruited to teacher education is usually considered an issue of supply and demand. Yet, socialization literature suggests that the manner of entry into a group (i.e., selection) is a critical dimension of the socializa-

tion process. Thus, decisions related to recruitment and selection have programmatic effects, as well as effects on supply and demand.

In addition to looking beyond more conventional features, viewing teacher education from a socialization perspective encourages one to view conventional features in unconventional ways. It is conventional to be concerned with the logic of the curriculum (e.g., what should be taught and in what sequence), and a socialization perspective encourages one to ask questions that go beyond the content of programs—questions such as, To what extent does an individual's identity with the group in which he or she is taught affect what is likely to be learned? Should student teachers be assigned in groups, clusters, or identifiable cohorts, or should they be assigned to individual teachers and isolated one from the other? Questions such as these are sometimes raised but too often are dismissed as trivial or, even worse, as logistical matters. A socialization perspective encourages one to view such questions as pedagogical as well as logistical.

A *Theoretical Perspective*

Although it is possible, and sometimes useful, to speak of the socialization system, it can be difficult to engage in precise discussion when the level of abstraction is as high as is suggested by the term *socialization system*. It is more useful to think of the socialization system as a set of subsystems. Of these, I have identified the following as most relevant to this discussion of teacher education:

1. the recruitment and selection subsystem,
2. the induction subsystem, and
3. the normative subsystem.

As will be seen, it is operationally difficult to separate these subsystems from each other because they are so integrated; a change in one component of one subsystem often brings about changes in one or more components of another subsystem. For example, the nature of the norms to be transmitted shapes and molds the nature of the induction subsystem. De-

spite these operational difficulties, I hope the reader will agree that the attempt to distinguish among the characteristics of these subsystems is worth the effort.

Organization of Monograph

My intent in the remainder of this paper is to do the following:

1. To present a general description of the three subsystems listed above with some of the more important characteristics of each.
2. To use these descriptions as a means of analyzing teacher education programs, especially preservice teacher education programs.
3. To use the analysis as the basis for specific recommendations regarding potentially useful changes in the design and delivery of preservice teacher education programs.

This book is not about sociology; it is about teacher education. I have endeavored to keep theoretical discussions to a minimum, and I have limited bibliographical references as much as possible without making myself vulnerable to the charge of plagiarism. The reader is advised, however, that most, if not all, of the theoretical notions upon which my thinking is based are widely discussed in the literature of sociology. I do not claim that these ideas are uniquely mine, though their application may be. Further, I have made no effort to be evenhanded in my selection of theoretical perspectives. As the sociological purist will know, I have opted for some modes of social explanation over others, and I seldom warn the reader when such a selection has been made.

CHAPTER 1

THE RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION SUBSYSTEM

In addition to the obvious functions of attracting and identifying potential group members, recruitment and selection procedures serve socialization functions.

First, recruitment and selection procedures can send relatively clear signals regarding what is likely to be expected of potential group members. Youth, speed, and agility, as well as physical height, are preferred attributes for college basketball players, and this is clearly signified in the recruitment and selection process. Law schools and medical schools emphasize academic prowess and the ability to test well, both to limit the potential pool of recruits and to give direction to the selection process; such emphases also send clear signals that the study of law or medicine is a serious academic business.

Second, procedures used in recruitment and selection can begin the process of separating a potential group member from prior affiliations and of integrating the potential member into the new group. For example, the Marine Corps slogan, "We want a few good men," clearly sends a signal that if selected by the Marines, one is set apart. Pride in being selected may not equal the pride one has in having survived boot camp, but pride in being a Marine *begins with being selected* to be a Marine.

The specific characteristics of the recruitment and selection subsystem that seem to have the greatest relevance for teacher education, with respect to the effectiveness of the socialization process, are

1. the criteria for recruitment,
2. the degree of selectivity,
3. the importance of sponsorship to selection, and
4. the expectation of prior commitment as a condition of selection.

Criteria for Recruitment

Whom a group wants as a new member and whom a group gets as a new member are not always the same. Some groups are unequivocal about whom they want and only take new members who meet a stated criteria. The Burning Tree Country Club, for example, wants only men. This club has never admitted a woman to membership, and recently the club spent considerable resources in a court case to ensure that the exclusionary rules were upheld.

Other groups may be clear about whom they want, but pragmatically they are willing to settle for less if the members they want are unavailable. Even seemingly exclusionary groups become pragmatic when their exclusionary standards threaten group survival. (The Shakers were a notable exception.) The reason elite groups can be exclusionary is because membership in the group is, for whatever reason, sufficiently attractive to people who meet the criteria that there is an adequate supply of new members.

Some groups are ambiguous about what they want in new members and are willing to take anyone who is willing to join them and, perhaps, willing to obey a few common rules. Usually such groups are temporary and are formed to meet immediate crises (e.g., a volunteer group placing sandbags on a dike in the midst of a flood).

In considering occupational socialization, the critical questions include: Does the group have criteria for recruitment? How clear and specific are these criteria? and, How widely known are the criteria?

In some occupations, the criteria for recruitment are specific; in others, vague. For example, it is generally the case that law schools and medical schools require that one be demonstrably successful as an under-

graduate. Employers such as IBM and AT&T give preference to college graduates from the top half, if not the top quarter, of their class. Conversely, for some jobs, recruitment criteria scarcely exist. The willingness to be present and do the job is all that is required (e.g., migrant labor).

Teaching seems to fall between these extremes. Teachers must be college graduates, and they must meet certification requirements. It is commonly held, however, that many teachers graduate from colleges where admission standards are less than rigorous, and the intellectual demands and quality of scholarship required in some teacher education programs are clearly questionable.

With respect to the distribution of knowledge regarding criteria for recruitment, there is also the possibility of wide variability. In some instances, the criteria for recruitment may be clear and specific but known only to a few persons, namely, those in charge of recruitment. In other instances, the criteria may be widely known. For example, it is widely known that to be admitted to a teacher education program, one must first be admitted to college.

For several reasons, the specificity of recruitment criteria and the distribution of knowledge about those criteria have important implications for the socialization process.

First, as indicated, recruitment criteria send clear messages regarding how present members of the occupation view themselves, what they hope for, and what they aspire to become. In addition, selection criteria indicate what the occupational group assumes to be important characteristics to be manifested by mature group members. The more precise the criteria for recruitment, the greater is the likelihood that prospective recruits will know what will be expected of them should they submit to the blandishments of the recruiting agency.

Second, clear criteria for recruitment, coupled with conditions that otherwise make the occupation attractive, can lead to a great deal of an-

ticipatory socialization and negative self-screening. For example, C students in high school seldom enroll in premedical programs, in part because such students realize that they are unlikely to be considered as legitimate recruits. On the other hand, C students in high school who want to be physicians know that they will need to change the quality of their academic performance once they have been admitted to college. If one assumes that attitude and work habits were the reasons for the mediocre high school performance, then the desire to be a physician, coupled with a clear notion of what it will take to be admitted to medical school, can serve as a powerful stimulant to reorient (i.e., resocialize) the student from the role of nonserious to serious student.

Finally, specificity and clarity of criteria for recruitment and the distribution of knowledge about these criteria serve to indicate boundaries of the group and, thus, suggest distinctive benefits and/or disadvantages of pursuing group membership. (Here, I am reminded of Groucho Marx's statement that he would not want to be a member of any club that would admit him.) Clear criteria for recruitment that are widely distributed indicate to the new recruit not only what attributes one must have to gain admission, but also what kind of person with whom one would associate if one gained admission.

Implications for Teacher Education

Numerous scholars have observed that one of the major barriers to the emergence of teaching as a profession is a lack of a distinctive occupational subculture and a clear occupational identity. Some suggest this is so because of a lack of a distinctive knowledge base upon which to base the subcultural norms. While I do not dismiss this suggestion, I am not convinced that teaching must wait on "research findings" before taking on a distinctive occupational identity. I am, in fact, convinced that the development and articulation of specific criteria for recruitment could contribute greatly to the creation of such an identity, perhaps even more

than the emerging research base will contribute. In addition, such criteria could increase the vitality of teacher education as a component in the occupational socialization of teachers.

In making this suggestion, I am mindful that some may take it as a suggestion that grade-point averages should be increased, prerequisite class rank raised, or test requirements somehow made more rigorous. I would not dismiss such criteria out of hand, but neither would I endorse them without qualification. What is more important, I think, is that schools of education, in cooperation with the public schools that employ teachers, give serious attention to the image they have of teachers and the image they think teachers should have. Given a clear vision of the nature of teaching and teachers, criteria for recruitment then may be articulated that reflect this image, and efforts could be made to ensure that the criteria are widely disseminated among prospective recruits to the teaching profession as well as among present members.

The process of arriving at consensus on the nature of this image will be difficult. The image of "teacher" that is appropriate in one setting may be inappropriate in another. Thus, although it is difficult to state explicitly what the standards for recruitment should be, it is possible to provide an illustration.

If one assumes that a part of the image of teaching is the image of serious scholar, then it would seem appropriate that recruitment criteria attend to evidence of scholarship. Will students who graduate in the top quarter of their class be given preference over those who graduate in the bottom quarter? Should admission to teacher education programs be limited to those who graduate in the top half of their college class? In answering these questions, it is critical to keep in mind that the question being asked is *not* simply one of technical competence (i.e., is a C student capable of becoming a good or outstanding teacher?). The question is

also one of occupational identity. Do we want teaching to be viewed as an occupation made up of C students?

If the answer to the latter question is "No," how might one state recruitment criteria to convey the notion that the teaching occupation gives preference to persons with demonstrable scholarly ability, while avoiding the possibility that potentially outstanding teachers are excluded because they failed to meet some arbitrary academic standard?

One way to achieve this end would be to develop multiple entry points with different criteria. For example, the teacher education program might indicate that it would admit students with a 3.0 average in the junior year, a 2.8 average in the senior year, and that persons with lower GPAs would not be admitted until they had graduated with a baccalaureate degree.

Such a procedure is not without precedent. Dental schools, schools of architecture, and law schools have used and continue to use similar processes. Schools such as these establish regular admission relatively late in the academic career (e.g., at the end of the baccalaureate) but provide for early admission for unusually talented academic prospects. For those who gain early admission, special provision is made to ensure that the liberal arts degree will be completed collaterally with the professional degree. The assumption is that those who have demonstrated the level of achievement necessary to gain early admission to the professional curriculum also have the capacity to do quality work in the liberal arts curriculum while pursuing a professional degree.

To implement such a recommendation, it would be essential that schools of education be organized as professional schools rather than as extensions of liberal arts schools. Further, it would require that the curriculum of the professional school be organized in ways that make it distinctive and compelling. Most importantly, it would require that those who are admitted to the professional school be viewed and view them-

selves as set apart from their liberal arts classmates. (This latter topic will be discussed more fully in connection with selection and induction.)

Degree of Selectivity

Selectivity is a slippery concept that connotes many mistaken notions. To say that an occupation is selective is only to say that many—if not most—of those who seek entry into the occupation are denied. Nonselective occupations afford membership to nearly all who apply.

Determinants of the degree of selectivity include the nature of the criteria for recruitment, the vigor with which these criteria are applied, and the characteristics of the potential pool of recruits. More critical, perhaps, is the degree to which the occupational group has the ability to induce those who meet or approximate the recruitment criteria to seek membership in the group. Unattractive occupations are likely to be nonselective, whereas attractive occupations are more likely to be selective.

Perhaps all of the above is obvious, but the obvious is not always taken into account in formulating policy. For example, arguments that teaching can be or should be an occupation oriented toward recruiting primarily, if not exclusively, from among the more academically able assume that teaching can be and should be organized in a way that makes it highly attractive to persons who have outstanding academic talent. There are problems with this view. First, what is meant by academically talented? Second, how is such talent best demonstrated and/or tested? Third, what level of performance criteria should be established? And fourth, are the criteria relevant to performance in the occupation?

The technical competence view of selection would suggest that selection should be related to success on the job. How, then, does one measure job success? Are people more successful if they produce more measurable results, or are they more successful if they get a job and keep it? If the latter, there is considerable evidence that college graduates who have the least academic ability as measured by standardized tests and col-

lege grades are more likely to be successful teachers. If the former, the evidence is less clear, though a convincing argument against high academic ability would be difficult to make.

My point is that technical arguments for and against any selection criteria are easy to muster. At present, we simply do not know which criterion or criteria could and should be used if the goal is to identify those persons in the recruit pool who are most likely to be effective classroom teachers.

Does this mean that teacher education should be nonselective? No! Even if it could be demonstrated that any given criteria for selecting in or selecting out prospective teachers were magnificently irrelevant to predicting teaching success, such a demonstration would not be a *prima facie* argument against selectivity.

Selectivity serves social functions as well as technical functions. The criteria used for recruitment and the way these criteria are applied in selection communicate, perhaps more clearly than any other single event, (a) how members of the occupation view themselves, and (b) how well the occupation is doing in imposing its perception of what it is and what it is about in the environment of which it is a part.

From 1900 to the mid-1960s, teacher educators argued for and successfully encouraged the view that teaching requires substantial academic attainment. Compelled by this image, teacher education has been upgraded to the point that nearly all teachers are required to have a baccalaureate degree. The difficulty is that too many people suspect this requirement has been met by downgrading degrees rather than upgrading teachers. The unfortunate facts that teachers are disproportionately drawn from the least academically able population of college graduates and that most teachers are graduates of the least prestigious colleges and universities serve to reinforce such a view.

I do not share the cynical view of the quality of teacher education that

the above line of argument suggests. Rather, I believe that the move from the normal school to the four-year baccalaureate improved the quality of teachers and teaching, but it did little or nothing to enhance the status of teaching as a selective occupation. If anything, it reinforced the contrary view. By embedding teacher education in the liberal arts academy, schools of education implicitly embraced the values of that academy. Thus, liberal arts values shape the explicit and implicit criteria for selecting teachers.

The values of the academy are values that emphasize academic ability and academic attainment. Members of the teaching occupation may view academic attainment as only one criterion relevant to selection into teaching. However, so long as schools of education are embedded in the value structure of the academy, perception of the selectivity of schools of education will be shaped primarily by the ability of these schools to attract students who most clearly manifest the values implicit in the concept of academic attainment, *à la* the liberal arts establishment.

The significance of the above observation can best be understood if one considers that the relative prestige of schools of education within this context of highly selective universities is low, despite that the graduates of teacher education programs in highly selective institutions are likely to be more academically able than college graduates in general. Thus, the absolute standards for admission to teacher education are not as important as is perceived selectivity in a given context.

In both the selective institutions and nonselective institutions, the assumed standards for selectivity are standards related to academic achievement. In those institutions where the standards are relatively high, those at the bottom are perceived as relatively low. This reinforces the perception that anyone can get into a teachers' college, because the prospective teachers' relative achievement in the selective university is likely to be low. In the nonselective institutions where anyone (academically speak-

ing) can get in, it is not surprising that anyone can get into any given program. Thus, the basis for invidious comparison is decreased in this less selective college. I suspect that the schools of education embedded in institutions with generally low academic standards for admission will gain much more from a push to improve academic admission standards for teachers than will those in more selective institutions. Schools of education embedded in institutions where admission standards are generally high will probably gain little with increased standards of admission and may, in fact, lose students. (See Schlechty and Vance, 1983, for a research-based illustration of this point.)

Implications for Teacher Education

Implicit in the discussion above is the idea that selectivity may be as important to the socialization process as are the criteria upon which socialization is based. Among the purposes of socialization are to set neophytes apart from their prior identities and to help them to embrace a new identity (i.e., an identity as a member of the group in which they aspire to be members). Selection is one means by which such separation and integration commence. Selection sets one apart from the nonselect. Admission processes destroy powerful socializing forces when the former do not set potential new members apart from others on some basis with social significance and meaning to those who are selected as well as those who are excluded.

Although it is not my intent to suggest what the selection criteria should be, I will make three specific recommendations regarding factors that should be taken into account in establishing these criteria.

1. **The selection criteria should be directly related to the criteria for recruitment** and should endorse symbolically the image of teachers and teaching to which the school of education is committed and upholds. If a scholarly image is a part of this image, then there should be scholarly selection criteria. If nurturance is a part of the image, then relevant criteria should be considered.

2. **Whatever the criteria are, the criterion level should be established at a point sufficiently high to assure that all of the relevant group who aspire to entry will not be able to gain entry.** For example, in a nonselective institution, establishing an SAT score for admission to a teacher education program at or above the median for high school seniors would exclude many college students who had been admitted to the institution. Thus, emphasis on academic criteria in nonselective institutions would enhance the real and perceived selectivity of teacher education programs. In institutions with more academically selective admission standards, emphasis on academic criteria, while not trivial, is less important. Teacher education programs on the academically selective campus that attempt to increase selectivity by increasing academic standards are likely to run out of students before they meet their goal. Such schools of education are, however, in a position to establish other relevant and vigorous criteria for admission. For example, a teacher education program on a selective campus might require public school students to take and do well in specified liberal arts courses. Given the significance of mental measurement in education, for instance, it might be appropriate to require an introductory course in psychometrics as a prerequisite for entry into teacher education. The point is, whatever the selection criteria, meeting these criteria should signify to self and others that one is set apart from others within the context of which one is a part.
3. **Schools of education should set numerical goals for recruitment.** They should not allow the conditions of volunteerism to set class size. The maximum size of the entry class should be announced beforehand rather than as an afterthought. The temptation to be nonselective is greatly reinforced when the size of the entry class is left to chance. Given funding formulas typical of institutions of higher education and given the value bureaucracies place on growth and expansion, the temptation is always to admit

more students regardless of how distantly they approximate the image held for what an admittable student should be. At the same time, the announcement of how many students a school commits to admit fastens attention on recruitment as well, for when qualified students are not available, an organizational crisis is created.

In my view, if the above recommendations were enacted, the following are likely to be the consequences.

1. Those who are admitted to teacher education programs would have a clearer notion than is now the case of why they were admitted and what attributes they possess that make them valuable as prospective teachers. This would enhance in-group pride and speed the process of assimilation into the occupation.
2. That the teacher education program is selective would become more widely known, and future aspirants would be in a position to better prepare themselves for entry (anticipatory socialization).
3. Faculties in schools of education would become more attentive to the need to recruit and retain persons of specified qualities, and others in a position to "sponsor" persons for admission to teacher education would be in a better position to make sound decisions regarding their sponsorship.
4. A discipline that does not typically exist would be imposed on the selection process. Further, public awareness of the criteria for selection and public understanding of the degree to which those criteria are vigorously applied would do much to enhance the status of teaching and, thus, the attractiveness of teaching to potential recruits. (If the criteria were not vigorously applied, these recommendations could have the reverse effect.)
5. General awareness of the criteria for selection (assuming these criteria are socially relevant) would enhance the likelihood of greater societal support for the norms and values that the image of teachers and teaching suggest should be supported. (For example, even Protestants know that Catholic priests are expected to take a

vow of celibacy. This generalized knowledge regarding the requirements for admission to the priesthood lends considerable support to the upholding of this norm even by those who are not particularly committed to it.) There was a time when the general community knew that teachers were expected to be readers of books. One cannot help but wonder whether the explicit statement of this expectation as a criterion for admission to teacher education programs might not serve to reinforce this norm.

Sponsorship Sponsorship can be one of the most powerful means of socializing new members. The idea of a mentor implicitly embraces the concept of sponsorship, for a sponsor is someone who is already a member of the occupation and who, at a minimum, accepts responsibility for recommending the new member to the group. Frequently, a sponsor is called on to do more (e.g., to provide tutoring, counseling, moral support, and constructive criticism).

Given the real and perceived abuses that can result from an overreliance on sponsorship as a means of gaining access to jobs (e.g., the good-old-boy network), it is tempting to bypass the topic as a component in the selection process. Yet, when selection is viewed as a part of the socialization system as well as a means of identifying appropriate talent, sponsorship cannot be easily dismissed.

In teacher education, sponsorship can, and sometimes does, take numerous forms. For example, writing letters of recommendation for entry into a teacher education program is a form of sponsorship, or it can be conceived to be so. The role of the university advisor or the supervising teacher also can be conceived as a sponsoring role.

With regard to socialization, it is important to understand that the most effective occupational groups in socializing new members typically give considerable emphasis to sponsorship both in the selection process and in the early stages of the induction process. Extensive evidence doc-

uments this phenomenon. For example, law schools and medical schools routinely seek letters of recommendation from liberal arts professors, in effect, asking the professor to sponsor a candidate's entry into the profession. Entry into military academies requires that one gain the sponsorship of a member of Congress. Some schools of theology require the sponsorship of a local minister or pastor.

Implications for Teacher Education

If teacher educators were to take the ideas of sponsorship seriously, there are a number of ways in which the quality of teacher education programs might be improved.

First, by requiring meaningful sponsorship as a condition of entry (as opposed to *pro forma* letters of recommendation), it might be possible to provide the neophyte with a tentative link inside the occupation even while he or she is an outsider. Second, by requiring meaningful sponsorship, potential applicants might be encouraged to engage in activity (e.g., seeking out a person who might sponsor them and getting to know them well enough to assure sponsorship) that would enhance the prospects of anticipatory socialization. In addition, if potential sponsors took their roles seriously, they would be in a position to encourage or discourage undecided or marginal applicants. Finally, if sponsorship were made a condition of entry into teacher education, it might be possible to broaden the base of responsibility for recruiting new teachers and to increase the commitment of members of the teaching corps to the notion that they have an obligation to assure the quality of the entrants.

There are a number of ways in which the concept of sponsorship might be built into the selection process, as the following illustrates.

1. It is common in some teacher education programs to require teacher education majors to have early field experiences, usually during the freshman or sophomore year. Since these persons have already been "admitted" to teacher education, it would be difficult to use assessments in these experiences as a part of the selection

process for teacher education. There are, however, schools of education where one is not admitted to teacher education until the junior or senior year. Such schools could easily require a preentry field experience as a part of their admission standards and ask a number of practicing teachers to provide a preliminary assessment of the person as a candidate for teacher education. This would require some training and orienting for the experienced teachers who would be expected to serve as sponsors. It would also require that careful thought be given to the design of experiences and activities that would be appropriate to the preentry field experiences.

2. It might be appropriate for schools of education to invent a role called *entry counselor* and/or *recruitment counselor*. Such persons could be assigned the responsibility of getting to know prospective candidates for entry into the teacher education program sufficiently well to provide a personal assessment of the likelihood that the potential applicant would be the kind of person that the recruitment criteria suggest is being sought. Again, this would mean that entry into teacher education could not be synonymous with entry into college unless, of course, a school of education were willing to expend considerable resources in making contact with high school seniors.
3. In those situations where high school populations are sufficiently large to warrant such an activity, school of education faculty, in cooperation with public school faculty, might begin early recruitment programs in high schools and middle schools. Properly managed, school of education faculty could become sufficiently knowledgeable about high school prospects to subsequently become sponsors, especially if the procedures suggested in #2 above were implemented simultaneously. (The Jefferson County, Kentucky, Public Schools and the University of Louisville have a program that is consistent with this suggestion.)

In summary, careful attention to the possibility of using sponsorship as

a mechanism in the selection process could have several advantages in addition to the obvious ones of providing more detailed data on which to base selection decisions. First, requirements of sponsorship could convey that entry into teacher education is more than a *pro forma* activity and that seeking entry is an important enterprise. Second, sponsorship requirements could increase the prospects of anticipatory socialization and strengthen the power of role models. (This latter suggestion is based on the assumption that those who are sponsors would also be exemplary teachers.) Finally, by creating a system of meaningful sponsorship, one sets in place from the beginning a mechanism supporting the idea that the socialization of new members is the responsibility of all present members of the group and not just a select few.

Prior Commitment

Occupations such as law and medicine require considerable prior commitment. To gain access to a medical school, one must first complete four years of college. To gain access to the medical occupation, one must complete four years of medical school, an internship, and probably a residency. From time to time, education reformers have suggested that similar prior commitments should be required for teachers. Recent proposals (e.g., the Holmes Group proposal) for more extended teacher education and for requiring a baccalaureate degree for entry into teacher education implicitly embrace the notion that more emphasis on prior commitment could have salutary effects on the quality of teachers and teaching. Explicitly, however, such proposals have more to do with the logic of the curriculum (what teachers need to know and how long it should take to learn what they need to know) than with the intent to increase the requirement for evidence of commitment.

Two reasons why requiring evidence of high commitment prior to entry may affect the socialization process seem obvious: Not only does heavy prior commitment screen out dilettantes, but also it can increase

the perceived value of entry to those who gain it. I am personally convinced that increasing the requirement for evidence of prior commitment (e.g., requiring a liberal arts degree as a precondition to enter teacher education) would have beneficial effects.

A problem arises, however, when the cost of meeting the requirements of prior commitment exceeds the benefits, which tends to discourage rather than encourage recruits. For example, many believe that increasing the college requirements for teachers to five or six years will adversely affect the supply of teachers, especially teachers with strong academic records. As things now stand, the teaching occupation is having a difficult time attracting an adequate supply of recruits even though standards for admission and graduation are relatively low. Given the impending teacher shortage and the relative lack of economic and career opportunities in teaching, it is likely that nothing short of a fundamental restructuring of the teaching occupation will increase the supply of candidates to a level that will meet the demand. Despite some evidence that when standards are raised, the number of applicants who can meet those standards increases, there remains reason to believe that placing additional burdens on individuals as a precondition to teacher education entry is not likely to help the supply situation and may, in fact, do harm.

Does this mean it is unreasonable or unrealistic to expect more evidence of prior commitment as a condition of entry into teacher education than is now the case? I think not. It means we must think differently about the conditions of entry and exit in teacher education, and we must have a better understanding of what is meant by *commitment*.

Commitment can be defined operationally as the willingness to allocate scarce resources, such as money, time, status, prestige, and honor. In the marketplace, people exchange one resource for another resource, such as a client buying a lawyer's time and expertise or a family buying status and prestige as well as basic shelter when they purchase a house.

If the intent in teacher education is to increase the requirement of prior commitment as a condition of entry (which I think it should be), then the problem is to determine what resources prospective applicants have to invest and what resources they most need or value. Many proposals for reform in teacher education assume that teachers could be better prepared if they would commit more time (1) prior to entry into teacher education and (2) during teacher education.

The notion that evidence of heavy prior commitment increases the effects and effectiveness of socialization processes is compelling. The question, then, is, How does one increase the demand for prior commitment as a condition for entry without having undesirable effects on other aspects of the selection and recruitment process? Some answers are suggested in the following section.

Implications for Teacher Education

Teacher education could, I believe, be much improved if those who sought entry could be brought to understand that learning to teach requires considerable investments of time and talent. Thus, it is in the interest of quality teacher education to create conditions in which talented individuals are willing to enter programs that require them to undergo a longer period of development than is commonly the case in present teacher education programs.

In the long run, the best way to increase the willingness of talented persons to commit their talents to a longer (and, thus, more costly) preparation period is to increase the economic and social attractiveness of the teaching occupation. Campus-based teacher educators, however, have little direct control over the structure of the teaching occupation or the rewards and incentives of the teacher's workplace. (It is for this reason that I have frequently argued that reform in teacher education must begin in the schools rather than in the teachers' college.) Given this reality, the only option open to campus-based teacher educators is to work

cooperatively with their colleagues in the public schools to create teacher education components in these organizations just as there are now teacher education components on the campus.

A commonly advocated strategy for addressing this issue is to make teacher education a postbaccalaureate program and provide free tuition and a modest stipend to qualified applicants. This idea is not without precedent. Military academies provide eighteen-year-olds with such benefits. Concepts such as a GI bill for teachers, forgivable loans, and teaching as a temporary activity (something like the Peace Corps) are, at present, being widely discussed in the education literature. Such solutions have the advantage of simplicity and require a minimum of cooperative action with public schools. The problem is that such solutions do not help to address the structural issues that must be addressed if prospective teachers are to be attracted in the first place. Moreover, once such solutions move beyond the pilot stage and masses of prospective teachers become enrolled in the programs, it is unlikely politicians will be inclined to support such efforts. The costs are simply too high, especially when many influential leaders have serious doubts about the importance of teacher education.

A second solution that is more difficult to manage than the first, and probably more expensive, would be to distinguish between clinical and nonclinical aspects of teacher education and make the nonclinical aspects part of the undergraduate curriculum (e.g., child growth and development, psychometrics) and the clinical training a part of a paid internship that takes place in specially designated and specially staffed schools (something like the professional development schools suggested by the Holmes Group).

Building on the second option, it would be possible to reconceptualize what is meant by preservice teacher education and to consider the first, second, or third year of teaching as part of the preservice training pro-

gram. Implicitly, some of the internship programs, such as those being implemented in North Carolina and Kentucky, involve such a reconceptualization. Programs like these are not without problems. First, there is the difficulty of coordinating relationships between institutions of higher education and the public schools. Second, there is the question of the relationship between performance and certification. Third, there is the problem of developing quality-control mechanisms within the schools to ensure that both the integrity of the teacher education program and the quality of instruction delivered to children are maintained. (Schlechty and Whitford 1989)

If, however, teacher educators want to take advantage of the socializing power of strong prior commitment and if they want to take appropriate advantage of the time made available by that commitment, it is essential that they orient their thinking as much toward developing strong supportive training environments in the public schools as toward restructuring the curriculum on the college campus. It has long been understood that teachers learn to teach on the job. If reform in teacher education is to be anything more than curriculum timekeeping and standard setting, it is essential that teachers learn to teach on the job. Any effort to restructure teacher education that does not involve a fundamental realignment of the relationship between public schools and schools of education is, in my opinion, misguided.

The most powerful socializing forces are models and exemplars. If teacher educators want to be a part of the socialization process, they will have to move into the arena where models and exemplars can be seen. It is not enough to establish these relationships on an *ad hoc*, personal basis. The creation of public-school-based laboratory schools and professional development schools will require a fundamental change in the reward structure of university campuses, the authority structure in public schools, and the status system of the teaching occupation. Such funda-

mental change requires strong and sustained institutional commitment. School of education faculty must be encouraged to allocate scarce resources to participate in and provide leadership to the development of new types of teacher education organizations. These new organizations must link the places where teachers are taught to teach (the university campus) with the place where teachers learn to teach (public schools). If teacher educators develop reforms that call for increased commitment from those who would teach but are themselves unwilling to increase their commitments (e.g., to give up the relative security of the university campus for the hurly-burly life of public schools), teacher educators are likely to find themselves increasingly irrelevant to the debate on reform in education—or so I believe.

A Concluding Remark

In summary, much can be said for increasing the amount of time individuals spend in university-related work prior to entry into teacher education. I am personally convinced that, as a rule, persons should not be permitted to enter a teacher education program until they have completed a liberal arts degree. Entry prior to this time should be limited to those who have outstanding academic records, with the expectation that they would complete the bachelor's degree requirement during the early stages of the teacher education program.

Such a position forces me to conclude that the formal preparation of teachers should require more than four years. For reasons I have expressed elsewhere, I am persuaded that a liberal arts degree should be viewed as a primary source of entitlement into teacher education and, subsequently, into the teaching occupation itself.

CHAPTER II

THE INDUCTION SUBSYSTEM

Conceptually, it is possible to distinguish between the recruitment and selection subsystem and the induction subsystem. Operationally, however, this distinction is difficult to make. As I have written elsewhere:

> Effective induction systems explicitly and implicitly use the process of recruitment and selection as an integral part of the induction process. Occupations with effective induction systems assume that participation in the unique life of the group requires one to separate from one's historic peers, commit oneself to the pursuit of entry into the group, behave in ways that indicate this special commitment, and submit oneself to the discipline of the group simply on the promise of approval (i.e., selection) by the group. And there is more. When selection does not occur, those who are rejected usually understand (even if they do not accept or like) the basis of the rejection. For example, a young person aspiring to an appointment at West Point knows that a sound academic record in high school, solid test scores, and sponsorship by a member of Congress are necessary prerequisites for entry into the academy. These conditions are generally known by all applicants to West Point because they are publicly announced and well articulated. The clear statement of criteria for admission to the occupation serves several important functions. It discourages those who do not meet the objective criteria from entering into the occupation. It permits those who meet minimal expectations but who are not selected to rationalize the reasons for their rejection. Finally, it allows those who are selected to conclude that they are indeed set apart and somehow different from "all the rest."
>
> Clear, rigorous selection criteria and the requirement that potential recruits demonstrate commitment to the occupation as a prior condition of

acceptance create psychological conditions that social psychologists have found to be conducive to the effective resocialization of adults. These conditions include a sense of estrangement from one's past peer group, a modest degree of anxiety and apprehension, and a sense of estrangement from one's traditional social bonds. I recognize that critics will consider such procedures inhumane and possibly counterproductive. There is no question that such procedures do cost society and individuals dearly. Perhaps teaching cannot and should not pay such costs. Perhaps more humane and less potentially destructive alternatives can be invented. I hope so.

On the other hand, I hope that tenderness of heart and concerns about the individual needs of recruits do not deflect attention from the fact that what is needed in schools are persons who are tender of heart and extraordinarily sensitive to the needs of students. Such persons are not ordinary in any society. Perhaps it is time we consider extraordinary means of selecting them. Caring for a persistently misbehaving child, understanding that a child's insults should not be taken personally, and believing that every child can learn are no more "normal" in our society than are the disciplined response of a defense attorney who is defending a mass murderer or the disciplined aesthetic attitude that permits a physician to lance a festering wound without becoming ill. Being a member of a fully developed human service occupation requires one to make abnormal (disciplined and controlled) responses to difficult circumstances. (Schlechty 1985, 38-9)

The Meaning of Induction

It is commonplace today for educators to use the term *induction* to refer to those training experiences to which beginning teachers are submitted. For example, some researchers refer to the first year of teaching as the "induction year." As a convention, such usage may be appropriate, but it reveals a naive understanding of the sociological and anthropological literature that discusses induction. In the technical literature of sociology and anthropology, the term *induction* is used to call attention to the early stages of socialization in which the processes of initiating new members into the group are likely to be formalized and stylized. Again, as I have written elsewhere,

The purpose of induction is to develop in new members of an occupa-

> tion those skills, forms of knowledge, attitudes, and values that are necessary to effectively carry out their occupational roles. And more than this, the primary aim of induction is or should be to create conditions that cause new members to internalize the norms of the occupation to the point that the primary means of social control (i.e., control over performance) is self-control. (Schlechty 1985, 37)

Given this view, the word *induction* is synonymous with the word *socialization*. The only reason for using the term *induction* is to call attention to concern for the early, more intensive, and formally structured stages of the socialization process. If preservice teacher education is to be conceptually and theoretically linked to the socialization of teachers, the only means of making this linkage is by the conceiving of preservice education as a part of the induction process.

That educators have limited their use of the term *induction* to the early years of teaching suggests several possibilities: (a) Teacher educators are unaware of or disagree with the technical use of the term. (b) Teacher educators do not see preservice education as a component in the process of the occupational socialization of teachers. (c) Those who study internship programs and experiences of first-year teachers have simply co-opted the term *induction* and are not concerned with theoretical (and perhaps practical and ideological) implications of this cooptation. (d) I am being picky and perhaps wrong. Given a multiple-choice test, I would choose c.

Less facetiously, I know that many of those who study first-year teachers and internship programs are knowledgeable about the sociological and anthropological literature in the area of occupational socialization. I know from personal experience that one of the greater concerns of many of these people is that preservice education is not integrated more fully into the initial experiences of teachers. I also know that my use of the term *induction* is technically correct. Consequently, the only reasonable explanation for the convention of using the term *induction* to apply only to early teaching experience is that most researchers do not see such a

usage as causing the kinds of theoretical and conceptual problems that I see this usage causing. Of course, it would be possible to limit use of the term *induction* to the first few years of teaching if one's intent were to understand how neophytes learn the peculiar norms of a particular workplace. Most who study induction, however, are concerned with how individuals learn the norms of the occupation and/or the profession. Theoretically, the norms of a profession transcend the norms of a particular workplace.

Given the perspective set forth above, I have chosen to assume that preservice teacher education is a part of the induction process, though it is certainly not all of the induction process. This assumption raises the following questions: Given the characteristics upon which induction systems might vary, which elements are most likely to have an effect on the socialization of preservice teachers? What differences might variance in these characteristics make in terms of the effects and effectiveness of the socialization process? Three of the more critical characteristics are

1. the conditions of admission,
2. the degree of status differentiation associated with entry, and
3. the nature of rituals, celebrations, and ceremonies.

The remainder of this chapter discusses each of these characteristics, indicates how these characteristics might vary, and suggests some implications for the design of preservice teacher education programs.

Conditions of Admission

It is commonly recognized that the quality of peer support, peer-group identity, and the nature of in-group and between-group activity and competition are significant determinants of the effect and effectiveness of socialization experiences. Although sometimes overlooked, the conditions of admission go far in determining the likelihood that the power of the peer group can be used effectively in the socialization process.

Admitting a cohort as a class and providing intensive initiating experiences can do much to enhance the resources that peer groups can pro-

vide to support the socialization process. Admitting individuals on a staggered basis and giving little attention to fostering peer-group solidarity and a common identity mitigate against developing such resources.

As in other areas, balance is necessary. Programs to provide common experiences to identifiable cohorts can become lockstep and violate what is known about individual differences and individual development. On the other hand, overattention to the characteristics of individuals and underattention to the power of group life as a source of motivation, direction, and control can have equally undesirable consequences.

The presence or absence of peer-group support and peer-group identity is a vital source of explanation of the effects and effectiveness of the socialization processes that occur. Thus, one of the more critical decisions teacher educators can make may be whether to admit prospective teachers as a class or whether to admit them individually.

Implications for Teacher Education

The socialization literature clearly indicates that attention given to the nurturance of group life among new inductees is energy well spent. Nearly anything done to foster in-group identity among neophytes can be turned to positive effect so long as the direction the in-group activity takes is supportive of the norms of the occupation. Even seemingly negative orientations can have beneficial effects. For example, the pressures of medical schools, law schools, or seminaries invite neophytes to join together to "beat the system." At a manifest level, such activity may seem dysfunctional; however, at a latent level, such activity can support interdependence, collegiality, and peer evaluation.

No magic formulas are available for creating conditions that support the emergence of peer-group solidarity and cohesiveness. Few guidelines exist for ensuring that group structures, once they emerge, will be oriented in ways that support the intentions of the organization. It is possible, however, to suggest some strategies that, if carefully implemented,

might make the power of the group more accessible to teacher educators than is now typical.

First, new students to teacher education could be admitted as a class. To support this admission pattern, all those who are admitted might be provided the names and addresses of all others admitted. They could also be given a class name (e.g., the class of 1995) rather than being designated as juniors or first-year students.

Second, the initial experience of entering students could, and I suggest should, be intensive training wherein the only participants would be the new class members and prime actors in the anticipated program. It might be well to conceive of this initial training experience as one would think of an intensive summer workshop for teachers. During the training, the inductees might live in a common dormitory, attend common classes, and interact among themselves and with their seniors.

The goal of the initial training could be substantive as well as procedural. Some subjects in teacher education lend themselves easily to instruction in a workshop setting. In addition, group dynamics could be enhanced with an eye toward developing class identity.

Numerous observers have commented on or alluded to the lack of cultural cohesion in teacher education versus the presence of such cohesion in fields like medicine and law. Cohesiveness is a major difference between the design of teacher education programs and those of the more established professions. The consequence of discontinuity is that the design of the teacher education program does little to separate neophytes from their past and instill in them the view that they are joining a distinctive group. Other than the content assigned for study, there is little difference between the experiences students have in the typical beginning education course (e.g., social foundations) and an introductory course in history or other subject. Provided with an intensive training experience in a retreat or quasi-retreat setting, most students would have

a different educational experience than they have had to that point in their educational careers. Properly designed and delivered, such experiences could be exhilarating and professionally confirming. At the same time, these experiences could generate group power that could be used in subsequent socialization experiences.

Status Systems

As Lortie (1975) observed, most fully developed professions are characterized by staged entry, which incorporates the concept of distinct status differentials (a) between neophytes and established members and (b) among neophytes who are at different points in the entry process. In some occupations, these status differentials are clear and well-marked; in others, they are vague or nonexistent. From the perspective of socialization theory, the most obvious advantages of staged entry and the status differences the concept suggests are as follows.

First, status differentials create the possibility of status attainment, which serves as a source of motivation. The egalitarian ideology that dominates much educational thought often leads educators to overlook the obvious fact that low status can serve as a source of motivation so long as the individual feels that he or she can do something to overcome the condition. Having survived a low-status position and made it to a higher-status position can be a source of pride. Low status is demoralizing only when one has little prospect of overcoming the condition and/or when the conditions of the status are so bad as to be psychologically or physically debilitating.

Second, with distinct and officially recognized status differences among newcomers who are at different stages of entry, the possibility of cross-status tutoring and support is increased. Although the topic has not been carefully studied, some evidence shows that the social distance between the person being taught and the person doing the teaching can have both positive and negative effects on what is learned. It is, perhaps,

the case that certain types of information are best transmitted by one who is relatively far removed (e.g., professor to student), while other kinds of information might be better taught by persons who are socially closer. I suspect that the more intimate or personal the lesson to be taught, the more likely the best teacher will be the one who has less social distance from the student. For example, a professor of educational philosophy would be an appropriate source of interaction in the general area of ethics and aesthetics, whereas a peer would do a better job with the feelings of revulsion one might experience when first encountering a severely handicapped student. Part of the socialization process is helping people to feel the way they should feel as well as helping them to do what they should do. A peer with slightly more status and experience might be more helpful in shaping such feelings than a professor who has long forgotten the feelings.

Third, staged entry provides distinctive marks of accomplishment and achievement along the course to full membership. Properly designed, patterns of staged entry can reinforce and enhance feelings of membership to those who are members and those who aspire to be members.

Implications for Teacher Education

A basic problem in teacher education is that those who teach teachers are seldom perceived as a part of the same status system as that of teachers. Teacher educators, in the main, are college professors who take their reward and get their status from the professoriate. Until this condition is changed, it is doubtful that staged entry can be fully implemented.

To fully act on the suggestions one might derive from the concept of staged entry, one would need to assume that those who are responsible for the clinical instruction of prospective teachers are perceived by others and themselves as high-status teachers rather than low-status college faculty. Thus, once again, the implications of socialization theory for teacher education is that campus-based teacher educators must invent

ways to become more closely linked to the workplace and status system of classroom teachers.

Less radical suggestions might include developing various strategies to assure status distinctions among first-year education students, second-year students, interns, nontenured teachers who have gone through an internship, and so on. Prerogatives and perquisites might be attached to these status differences. For example, one might simply formalize some of the informal status symbols that now typify schools. First-year teachers might be expected to chaperon social functions whereas more senior teachers might be excused from such duty. On the college campus, first-year students might be addressed by their given names, whereas more senior students might be addressed by Mr. or Ms.

I recognize that any specific suggestion I might make regarding these matters runs the danger of appearing trivial, stilted, or mean spirited. I take this risk precisely because I am convinced that teacher educators underestimate the natural status systems that already exist in schools of education and in public schools generally. The nature of these status systems may vary from institution to institution just as the prerequisites associated with status will vary. However, there are few institutions where status systems do not exist, and there are few status systems that are not supported by meaningful symbols. I suggest that teacher educators should study these natural systems and attempt to associate these systems with the concept of staged entry. In the process, educators may discover ways of overcoming the negative effects of some of the present systems by which status is allocated. For example, one often finds high schools in which the least experienced teachers are assigned to teach the most difficult children. It is quite common to find the role of substitute teacher, which is a difficult one to fulfill, assigned to the least qualified members of the faculty. Perhaps it is time to invent ways to make the teaching of difficult students a high-status activity reserved only for senior teachers

with outstanding competence and/or reserved primarily as the domain of those who would take on the role of teacher educators. Hospitals and law firms reserve the most difficult cases for their highest status members. Perhaps teacher education could take a lesson from these more established professions.

Rituals, Ceremonies, and Celebrations

In recent years, the power of ritual and ceremony in motivating and orienting human action in organizations has become more fully appreciated than in earlier periods. The word *ritual* had come to have a pejorative connotation, and things that were "only ceremonial" were seen as without meaning or significance.

Some people still see ritual and ceremony as without particular relevance to the educational enterprise. They are wrong. Rituals and ceremonies, rites of passage, and shared ordeals are, or can be, significant components of the socialization process. Rituals and ceremonies (e.g., graduation exercises, initiation rituals, repetition of oaths or pledges) make public otherwise private events and commitments. Such ceremonies and rituals can serve as symbolic glue that bonds the individual to the group and the group to the individual.

Rites of passage (e.g., taking a test for entry or promotion from one status to another, learning a particular litany and repeating it before full members of the group, doing relatively onerous tasks as a way of paying one's dues) can signify the individual's commitment to entering the group, willingness to submit to the discipline of the group, and progress made toward full membership. At the same time, rites of passage give the group opportunities to observe the neophyte's performance in situations of extreme vulnerability. Though some temporary embarrassment may occur at these times, the fact that one can make mistakes and still be acceptable to the group can be among the learnings that rites of passage convey. If the rites of passage are sufficiently meaningful and the con-

tent of the associated rituals sufficiently rich, full members of the group will realize their investment in the success of each member of the class. (Here the concept of mentor comes quickly to mind.)

Shared ordeals are rites of passage in which groups (rather than isolated individuals) are brought into the larger group. For example, the intensive introductory workshop discussed earlier could be a shared ordeal. The scheduling of qualifying exams on a seasonal basis (e.g., all doctoral students taking written exams at the same time and perhaps in the same room) also has potential as a shared ordeal.

The significance of the shared ordeal with respect to occupational socialization is found in at least two areas. First, the shared ordeal encourages mutual action and in-group bonding. It reinforces the notion that one is a member of a group as well as an individual actor. Common passage through specified ordeals at specified times encourages continuity of the group and prepares the group, as a group, for the later stages of the socialization experience. Second, the shared ordeal can encourage considerable self-evaluation and place one in a position to receive powerful feedback from one's peers. These activities can do much to reinforce self-control, which is the aim of socialization.

Ritual, ceremony, rites of passage, and shared ordeals can be misused, abused, trivialized, made harmful, and made meaningless. Further, what is meaningful in one context might be embarrassing or stilted in another. Affect, which is the primary point of ritual and ceremony, and sentiment are perhaps the most context-sensitive aspects of human performance. For example, handshaking, which is a ritual form of greeting, is commonly done in public in American culture, but kissing, another ritual form of greeting, is less common in public, especially between men. When former President Jimmy Carter acceded to the Russian custom of kissing visiting dignitaries on the cheek, his action became the subject of considerable commentary and derision in the American press.

Implications for Teacher Education

Given the context-sensitive qualities of ritual and ceremony, as well as the context-specific nature of rites of passage and shared ordeals, it is impossible to suggest more than a few specific ceremonies, rituals, rites of passage, or ordeals that might be meaningful in any given school of education. What is important is that those who design teacher education programs should be sensitive to the need for ritual and ceremony, rites of passage, and intensive shared experiences.

Schools of education could do much more than is typical to make entry or acceptance into the school have ritual meaning. Things that might be done include

1. sending certificates of acceptance rather than mimeographed letters of admission.
2. notifying local newspapers that the student has been accepted and indicating how many applied who were not accepted.
3. assigning more advanced students or faculty members to write letters welcoming the individual as a *prospective* member or, perhaps, making personal telephone calls.
4. sending some material object (e.g., a sweatshirt, a pin) that carries the school's identity on it.

Similarly, more could be done to signify progress and status. Class rosters, for example, might be more widely distributed. Students who do unusually well on critical exams or in particular courses could be singled out for meaningful honors (e.g., paid trips to conventions). The point is to celebrate success and to instill pride. Given the current low status of schools of education and of education students on the typical campus, feelings of success and pride are likely to be sorely lacking. Without such feelings, the motivational context needed to make the more technical—and less emotionally compelling—aspects of teacher education meaningful is likely to be missing as well.

CHAPTER III

THE NORMATIVE SUBSYSTEM

Effective induction systems are based on and oriented toward clearly stated, well-articulated, and generally understood expectations and norms. Without codified norms, the development of a systematic induction process is nearly impossible. One cannot be inducted until there is something into which to be inducted. If the only norms that count are the idiosyncracies of someone in authority, one has an authority system upheld by the sheer exercise of power, not a normative system conducive to professionalism and growth. Further, the exercise of power can easily become arbitrary and capricious if it is not submissive to a normative order that disciplines the group.

Given the centrality of norms to induction, a discussion of the nature of norms seems in order. After discussing some general propositions related to norms, I will identify some of the characteristics that seem typical of the normative subsystem, characteristics that are most conducive to effective socialization. Finally, I will suggest some implications for reform in teacher education.

On the Nature of Norms

All occupations, from the simplest to the most complex, call upon individuals to do some things in prescribed ways. To fry an egg, for example, a short-order cook must know and act on the knowledge of the appropriate heat for frying eggs. An apprentice carpenter is expected to drive nails straight and to remove bent nails. A few infractions of this

rule (norm) will be tolerated, but continuous infractions will bring censure and ridicule, even from other apprentices.

If all occupations have some norms that apply in peculiar ways to their respective members, then all occupations have within them the embryonic structure of a fully developed normative order. In fully developed occupational groups, which sometimes are referred to as professions, the normative order is sufficiently comprehensive (i.e., the norms cover a wide range of behaviors) and complex (i.e., the number of norms that apply in a situation is large and the relationships among these norms are intricate) that one can begin to speak of a distinctive occupational culture or subculture.

Types of Norms

Because so many sociologists have written so much about the nature and structure of norms, the relationship among norms, and their impact on social action, one could easily write a book that does nothing more than review this literature. At the outset, I acknowledge that much I will say here has been suggested by other sociologists (e.g., Williams, Parsons, Mills, Goffman, and numerous others). Those familiar with sociological thinking will find little new here.

In general, norms can be classified into four types (Williams 1960): moral norms, aesthetic norms, technical norms, and traditional or procedural norms. Moral norms include standards of good and bad, right and wrong. Aesthetic norms include matters of taste and beauty. Combined, aesthetic and moral norms shape our views of what House (1980) referred to as Truth, Beauty, and Justice.

Moral and aesthetic norms provide the standards against which other norms are evaluated. For example, the preference for basing the technical norms of teaching (teaching practice) on experimentally derived scientific knowledge, as opposed to custom and convention, is a moral and aesthetic choice. (This particular choice, by the way, is more frequently

made by members of the research community than by practitioners, who assign considerably more value to custom and tradition than do researchers. Thus, the often-noticed hiatus between theory and practice may be due to more than a lack of understanding. This gap may be the product of a clash between two normative orders, or subcultures, one of which displays a moral and aesthetic preference for knowledge derived from research, and the other of which displays a moral and aesthetic preference for knowledge derived from tradition and custom.)

Technical norms include the standards for how to do the job (e.g., how to drive a nail, how to present a lesson, how to suture a laceration). Traditional or procedural norms indicate how to proceed in areas where there are few or no technical norms to guide action. For example, it is customary to drive on the right side of the road in the United States, but the left side in England. The technical aspects of operating an automobile are not affected.

Characteristics of Normative Systems

No single paper or book can provide a definitive answer to the question, What characteristics of normative systems are most effective in supporting occupational socialization? One thing, however, is clear: Among the more critical characteristics is the way in which the norms to be transmitted to neophytes are *distributed* among those who serve as norm transmitters (i.e., those with formal and informal authority to provide instruction and evaluative feedback to neophytes). Distribution can vary in a number of ways as follows (see Williams, 1960, for a more detailed general discussion of this matter).

1. **The diffuseness of knowledge about the norms.** More specifically, what proportion of the norm transmitters know what the norms are and how detailed is that knowledge? The wider the distribution of knowledge about the norms and the greater the detail of understanding, the greater is the likelihood of effective

norm transmission. (This proposition is amazingly similar to propositions regarding goal clarity and effective schools.)

2. **Moral commitment to the norms.** Here, the concern is with the degree to which norm transmitters accept the norms and are willing to uphold them. The prohibition amendment illustrates a norm that was widely known, but garnered little moral commitment; whereas the incest taboo illustrates a norm also widely known, but having high moral commitment. Socialization systems in which norm transmitters have high moral commitment to the norms are more likely to be effective.
3. **The universality of the application of the norms**. Do all norms apply to all members of the group (including norm transmitters), or are there specialty norms that everyone knows but that apply only to some persons or special categories of persons? The point here is not universal versus specialty norms, but whether the basis for the special norms is assumed to be legitimate, i.e., is itself normative. For example, both priests and laymen accept the specialty norm of priestly celibacy as legitimate, though the norm applies only to priests and other members of religious orders. On the other hand, if too many teacher educators do not practice what they preach, they may be claiming special status that teachers do not accept as legitimate.

Implications for Teacher Education

The implications of the above propositions for teacher education are among the more crucial implications that one can derive from the literature on occupational socialization. In addition, careful consideration of these propositions can shed considerable light on some of the more serious deficiencies in our present system of educating teachers. First, I will discuss the current scene and then make some suggestions for reform and change.

A major difficulty in teacher education is that no one has a clear image of who are, and who should be, norm transmitters. Officially, those

who teach on college campuses, known as teacher educators, are the norm transmitters. Yet, all but the naive know that teachers learn about teaching from many sources other than teacher educators and that teacher educators sometimes have the least impact on what prospective teachers come to know, believe, and understand about their craft. Thus, in the natural system of teacher education, there are many norm transmitters other than those who are officially designated to play such roles.

The confusion regarding who are and who should be norm transmitters is compounded by three additional conditions. First, within schools of education and their respective institutions of higher education, it is unclear who the teacher educators are and who they are not. Some education faculties tend to view all faculty members as teacher educators, including liberal arts faculty. Other education faculties designate responsibility for teacher education to a more limited group of faculty members (e.g., departments of secondary education are responsible for the prospective secondary teachers, departments of elementary education for elementary teachers, and so on), although with departmentalization, confusion can exist. Is educational psychology, for example, a part of teacher education if the professors are housed in organizational units labeled *foundations*? Or, is teacher education best conceived as the exclusive purview of those who are responsible for more clinically oriented subjects (e.g., methods, practicum, etc.)?

Partly as a result of the internal confusion, a second problem emerges—the problem of status. In fully developed professions, norm transmitters are usually viewed as high-status members of the occupation. Yet, one commonly finds teacher education occupying one of the lowest status positions within a school of education, just as schools and departments of education often occupy low-status positions in the college or university. In major research institutions, too often one finds some of the

more powerful socializing experiences (e.g., student teaching) relegated to the lowest status persons in these systems (i.e., graduate students).

Within the academy, and especially in the more distinguished universities, the prestige and status of a professor of education seem to be inversely related to the degree to which he or she works directly with teachers in the clinic. Considerably more prestige and honor are attached to conducting a graduate seminar for school administrators than to supervising 10 to 20 student teachers. Similarly, the major universities consider it more prestigious to publish an article in the *American Educational Research Journal* than in *Instructor Magazine*.

A third problem is more subtle but equally important. Operationally, preservice teacher education takes place in two distinct organizations—the university or college and the public school. Furthermore, the operational norm transmitters—campus-based teacher educators (however defined)—and practitioners in schools are accountable to different systems, participate in different reward structures, and generally participate in cultures that are distinctly different from and sometimes antagonistic toward each other. Given these differences, it should be no more surprising that the norms and values campus-based teacher educators attempt to transmit are sometimes spurned by practitioners as mere theory than that campus-based teacher educators jealously guard their right to grade student teachers, precisely because they have little confidence that practitioners would know good teaching if they saw it. (Educators do not write much about this subject, but anyone who has worked around teacher educators on university campuses knows that some hold practitioners in low regard, especially when the practitioners of concern are principals or supervisors.)

The often-noted hiatus between educational theory and educational practice exists in part because theory tends to be generated in a culture where it does not apply (the university), and efforts to apply theory are

made in a culture where few theoreticians practice (the public schools). Efforts to apply theory often take place in environments where it is normative (i.e., expected and required) that one disavow allegiance to theory as a condition to full membership in the group. One of the finest compliments a practitioner can pay a campus-based teacher educator is that he or she is "down to earth and not too theoretical."

Another difficulty a normative analysis of current teacher education suggests is found in the lack of consensus among the norm transmitters regarding what the norms are or should be. Sometimes, this lack of agreement is accompanied by lack of knowledge; for example, the teacher educator who fails to transmit research-based norms simply because he or she is unaware of the research. Sometimes, the disagreements are based on lack of moral commitment to the norms (i.e., the individual teacher educator knows what others think the norms should be, but personally disagrees with these "others"). For example, many teacher educators view the existing research on teaching to be too narrow and prescriptive to serve as an adequate basis for normative consensus in teacher education. Others, however, seem quite willing to embrace this emerging research base as an adequate legitimizing base for normative consensus.

More typical may be the norm transmitters (teacher educators) who so seldom communicate among themselves that few know what the others are doing or what norms they are upholding. This is especially likely on the campuses of highly prestigious universities where the norm of independent scholarship translates to what should be taught as well as to what individual scholars should study.

Thus, neophytes often receive mixed messages regarding the norms of the occupation from their campus-based teacher educators even in the same school or department. These mixed messages are made worse when compounded with messages from practitioners in the clinical setting.

As one consequence, the normative disarray typical of teacher educa-

tion encourages the formation of schools of thought, cliques, and advocacy groups aimed at advancing one set of norms and procedures in preference to others. Typically, such schools, cliques, and groups grow up around a particularly compelling person or ideology, and slogans and symbols describing such collective orientations abound.

The fractious tendencies in education parallel that of medicine in its earlier history. Between 1840 and the early 1900s, American medicine experienced a similar state of normative disarray. Like education today, schools of medicine often represented specific schools of thought about medicine, and/or various faculty subgroups formed cliques that advocated one approach above others. Such developments were accompanied by monumental battles within and between faculties.

Although fractious, the organization of people around modes of thought is at the heart of a coherent normative order. Further, the emergence of a coherent normative structure does not preclude the continuation of diverse schools of thought, cliques, and advocacy groups. For example, cancer treatment and cancer research continue to be typified by divergent schools, cliques, and advocacy groups as do other fields of medicine, law, theology, and architecture. For education, the crucial questions are as follow: Have the dissenting factions agreed upon norms (rules and procedures) for determining the ways in which normative consensus is to be sought? Is normative consensus viewed as an end worthy of pursuit? In the case of American medicine, the more deleterious effects of normative dissension were overcome when norm transmitters (i.e., those who taught in medical schools) and high-status practitioners (physicians who practiced medicine in urban hospitals rather than offices and the patients' homes) committed themselves to the normative propositions that practice should be research-based and that disputes over preferred practice should be resolved by disciplined clinical trials. Such agreement may have potential for the field of education.

The absence of normative consensus in education and the inability to identify an appropriate basis for establishing such a consensus are not viewed with dismay by all educators. Those most committed to the culture of the liberal arts academy, for example, make a convincing argument that such disagreements are what universities are about—the free play of ideas in a world of independent scholars.

A fundamental difference exists, however, between the normative order that is appropriate to disciplining ideas (i.e., the normative order of the liberal arts institution) and the normative order that is appropriate to disciplining practice with ideas (i.e., the norms of professional schools). The search for "best practice" is central to the professional school mission, and rules for making short-term and long-term decisions regarding what constitutes best practice are at the heart of professional knowledge.

Given this view, I suggest that campus-based teacher educators must make a choice. Either they should cast their lot with the liberal arts faculty and accept that their primary missions are the study of pedagogy and teaching others how to study pedagogy (neither a small chore nor an unimportant one), or they should commit themselves to the view that they have an obligation to identify and transmit best practice to neophytes. If the latter choice is made, the norms of the professional school are most appropriate, for the norms insist on some degree of normative consensus regarding what best practice is and how it should be determined.

Professional schools also require a certain degree of moral commitment to these norms and a primary loyalty and commitment to the occupation for which the school is preparing the neophyte (i.e., a professional school orientation would require that teacher educators have a primary commitment to the teaching profession rather than the professoriate*). If the former view dominates (i.e., that the normative structure of the liberal arts department is to be preferred), then schools and departments of edu-

*I recognize that many professors will take exception to my insistence that the professoriate is not a part of the teaching profession. It is, but only in the sense that directors of staff de-

cation might better position themselves vis-a-vis teacher education the way the natural science departments on university campuses are positioned vis-a-vis medical education.

As is probably clear, my bias is toward the professional school model. I suggest that if campus-based schools of education cannot be oriented more toward the professional school model (and I have some doubt that they can), then it may be time to create relatively independent professional schools of education based primarily in the public schools. Such schools, operating with contractual arrangements with colleges and universities, would employ teacher educators as high-status teachers (i.e., members of the teaching profession). Their mission would clearly be committed to transmitting norms of best practice in the context of schools and classrooms.

The Dilemma: Liberal Arts Academy or Professional School

Professional schools are organized to transmit to neophytes the norms of the occupation whose interest these schools are designed to serve. In addition, professional schools are symbolic decision makers regarding what constitutes best practice in the occupation and the primary source of new knowledge upon which changes in practice are based. Professional schools are the basic institutional unit used to legitimize change in practice, first, by incorporating the change into the training programs for neophytes and, second, by updating established members regarding advances in the field.

---

velopment in industry, or others who have formal responsibility for providing instruction, are members of the teaching profession. Those who teach elementary and secondary school students simply do not work under the same conditions or in the same kinds of institutions as do college professors. Certainly, some colleges are more like high schools than they are like most colleges. Conversely, some high schools are more like most colleges than they are like most other high schools. It is, perhaps, a commentary of the values of higher education institutions that the closer a high school comes to being like a college, the more likely college faculties (including some teacher educators) are to hold the high school in high regard.

Professional schools are based on the assumption of relative consensus regarding what constitutes good practice among those who occupy official positions as norm transmitters in the school. Without this consensus, professional schools cannot fulfill their mission. Though such consensus is never fully present, consensus is perceived as a goal worthy of pursuit. Because normative consensus is so important, most professional schools (and most of the occupations served by professional schools) have elaborated rituals, procedures, programs, and protocols that must be followed when dissension is present.

Professional schools are also important to the discipline and control structures established by the occupation to assure that best practice is upheld, not only by individual practitioners, but also by the organizations in which the practitioners work. Because persons employed in professional schools are viewed as high-status members of the occupation, professional school faculty are frequently called on to serve on review boards and panels, to conduct or participate in malpractice procedures, and to establish and maintain standards for institutional accreditation.

The norms and values of the professional school are, therefore, idealized (this is not to say ideal or perfect) versions of the norms and values that are supposed to dominate the profession as a whole. It is expected that professional schools will uphold the best practice, for professional schools are the arbiters of what constitutes good practice. Most of all, the mission of the professional school will encompass disciplining practice with an established and agreed upon body of knowledge, lore, and tradition that has itself been disciplined according to standards the members of the occupation find desirable (e.g., the clinical trial in medicine, the precedent-setting case in law).

The discipline and orthodoxy required by the normative order that must be upheld if a professional school is to be established are, in some ways, contrary to the norms and values implicit in the liberal arts estab-

lishment where the mission is to discipline ideas, rather than to discipline practice with ideas. Professional schools do not discourage the unorthodox or novel application of ideas to practice, but they do not encourage the application of unorthodox, marginally tested, or poorly established ideas themselves. The liberal arts tradition encourages one to pursue unorthodox and novel ideas and to submit these ideas to the discipline of the scholar.

Thus, an inherent clash occurs between the values and norms of the professional school and the values and norms of the liberal arts academy. This clash in values is best summarized by the question, Should practice be based on theory, or should theory be based on practice? The professional school's answer is the latter: theory should be based on practice. The liberal arts academy is more likely to answer that practice should be based on theory. In 1967 Willard Waller, who was a master at taking established ideas and using them in novel ways to help to understand and discipline educational practice, put the matter this way:

> . . . both the theory and practice of education have suffered in the past from an over-attention to what ought to be and its correlative tendency to disregard what is. When theory is not based upon existing practice, a great hiatus appears between theory and practice, and the consequence is that the progressiveness of theory does not affect the conservatism of practice. (192)
>
> . . . A central point of the teacher's training . . . should be the attempt to give him insight into the nature of the social reality which is the school. This is what teachers usually learn in the hard school of experience, and by those rules of thumb which experience gives, and this is another reason for the conservatism of educational practice. Prospective teachers learn all the new educational theories while they are in schools, but they must learn how to teach from horny-handed men who have been teaching a long time. But if theory is ever really to be translated into practice, theorists must learn to follow it through the social dynamics of the classroom. Only so can experience be fruitful in the understanding that will make possible a change of things that are. (459)

It is, I think, more than coincidence that the so-called effective teaching and effective schools research, which in some ways follows Waller's suggestion that "theory must be based on practice," has such currency among practitioners. It is also more than coincidence that practitioners find Madeline Hunter appealing, for her primary claim is that she provides a framework for describing what good teachers have always known.

The problem is that the teaching profession has yet to establish norms and procedures for testing the claims some would make for their particular "practice-based theory." For example, now that we know something about what effective teachers do, how do we determine that if other teachers do these things they will be effective? Many states are developing evaluation systems and beginning teacher-training programs on the assumption that if teachers teach the way the "effective teaching research" suggests, teachers will be more effective. Is this so, how would we know, and who is empowered to say so? These and similar questions cannot be answered without increasing normative consensus among practitioners and those who symbolically are charged with the duty to transmit the norms of the occupation.

Such normative consensus cannot develop outside of a professional school context, and therein lies the dilemma for teacher educators. If a professional school context is to be established, the school must have sufficient autonomy to establish and maintain a normative structure that is different in many ways from the normative structure that typifies the liberal arts departments. Further, the professional school and its faculty must be linked in fact as well as rhetoric directly to the world of practice. The norms and values of the occupation should serve as the primary focus of the professional school; the norms and values of the academy should be secondary. Status in the professional school should be associated in part with status in the teaching profession. The professional

school should be at least as accountable to the clinic (the schools served) as to the university of which it is a part or with which it is affiliated.

To bring about the changes that are needed, one must face the political realities of power and cultural dominance. So long as campus-based schools of education are embedded in the liberal arts framework, as is now the case on most campuses, the values and norms of the liberal arts academy will prevail in those schools. Working in the clinic (i.e., the school house) will continue to be devalued, especially when rewards are distributed (e.g., promotion, tenure, and merit pay). Publications that are aimed at disciplining practice with ideas will be less valued than are publications aimed at disciplining ideas (i.e., research studies as opposed to evaluation studies).

Proposals suggesting that schools of education should be organized as professional schools are not new. Such proposals have come from highly respected teacher educators (e.g., B. O. Smith) and national organizations (e.g., AACTE). Why then has little movement occurred? The pace of change has been slow because of the difficulty in determining whether the goal of establishing schools of education as professional schools is to enhance the status, authority, and performance of the teachers, or whether the goal is to enhance the status, authority, and autonomy of campus-based teacher educators. If the former, I believe there is a reasonable chance that campus-based teacher educators can, and will, play a vital role in the professional preparation of teachers. If the latter, campus-based preservice teacher education may increasingly be viewed as irrelevant to the arguments about reform and revitalization of public schools.

Put directly, I believe that any effort to reform teacher education that is not linked to fundamental reform in the structure of the teaching occupation, the management systems of schools, and the reward and status

systems of higher education will miss the mark. As Dreeben (1970) wrote:

> Although there is much to be said for showing concern about the competence of teachers, the question of competence may be more fully understood in terms of the occupational characteristics of teaching rather than in terms of the curriculum of teacher training institutions . . . Problems of competence grow out of the relationship among schools of education, universities, and school systems; between training institutions and prevailing career patterns; and from the way these institutions shape the occupation and its members. (*vii*)

Whether campus-based teacher educators will have the courage and the political skill to conceptualize and support the kind of radical reform called for remains to be answered over the next decade. There can be little doubt that the kind of reform called for will threaten the short-term interest of teacher educators, just as it will threaten the short-term interest of nearly every party engaged at present in the teacher education enterprise. Necessary reform will require that campus-based teacher educators admit practitioners as full partners in making decisions regarding what should be taught, when, how, and by whom. Thus, the traditional autonomy of campus-based departments from unwanted outside influence will be eroded. Similarly, needed reform will require that practitioners who have responsibility for the early induction experiences of teachers be more accountable to the teacher education establishment than is now the case. This also will clearly change the structure of relationships between public schools and teachers' colleges—or those agencies that are created to replace teachers' colleges.

Change is not always comfortable, and change does not always serve the short-term interest of all the affected individuals. What must be weighed are the long-term costs of maintaining the status quo as opposed to the short-term costs of change. In my view, the long-term cost of resistance to change is likely to be the demise of higher education as a vital force in the professional education of teachers. It will be difficult to es-

tablish professional schools of education outside the context of institutions of higher education, but it is not impossible. What campus-based teacher educators must decide is whether they want to be partners in reinventing American public education, or whether they will be content defending the eroding turf upon which they now stand.

Professional Preparation Programs

No arguments are more compelling for the need to fundamentally restructure the organization of teacher education than the arguments generated from a careful analysis of what is known regarding the characteristics of effective systems for transmitting occupationally relevant knowledge. The purpose of this section is to describe the characteristics of these systems and then to discuss the implications for reform in teacher education.

The Issue of Purpose

Occupations that are effective in inducting neophytes and maintaining commitment to the norms of the occupation, as noted, are clear regarding the nature of the norms to be transmitted and the kinds of performances to be accepted as evidence of conformity to those norms. Equally important, these occupations expect and require conformity. This is not to suggest that creativity and change are discouraged, but that the occupation has specified norms regarding how experimentation will occur and how change will be endorsed. Medicine, for example, has explicit protocols that must be followed when practice goes beyond conventional treatments. In law, one finds not only precedents, but also precedents regarding the way in which precedents may be set. Further, precedent-setting cases in lower courts are subject to review and reversal by higher courts. (One way the bar evaluates judges' competence is by counting the number of their precedent- setting cases upheld or reversed by higher courts.)

Given the clarity of the norms and the general consensus regarding the

state of the art in the occupational field, the purpose of occupational socialization takes on a clear focus. The commitment of the trainer is oriented toward the profession rather than toward the individual professional. The intent of occupational socialization is to encourage the neophyte to commit self to the discipline of the group and the norms to which the group is committed. Self-awareness and personal development are not totally dismissed, but occupational awareness and occupational development are given primacy.

In sum, the purposes of effective occupational socialization are

1. to make the neophyte aware of the norms, values, and expectations of the occupational group;
2. to provide the neophyte with instruction and clinical experience that will develop the knowledge and skills necessary to enable the individual to uphold the norms; and
3. to provide sources of motivation that will encourage individuals to internalize these norms and be committed to them.

Implications for Teacher Education

As indicated, teacher educators do not agree on what the norms of the occupation are or what they should be. More important, individual teacher educators seem uncomfortable with the proposition that the goal of their program should be conformity to some established norms.

From a sociological perspective, the aim of teacher education should be to indoctrinate the naive into the norms of the occupation, develop the skills and knowledge required to conform to those norms, and foster individual commitment to upholding the norms. If teacher education is to be anything more than idiosyncratic prescriptions based on personal recollections and individual bias, then teacher educators must accept that the primary aim of teacher education is social control.

Should such a view of the purpose of teacher education gain support among teacher education faculties (whether they are affiliated with universities or schools), some of the practices that are now typical in many

teachers' colleges would need to be abandoned. For example, professors charged with supervising early field experiences for undergraduates often encourage those under their tutelage to critique the performance of the teachers whom they observe. Such an assignment implicitly conveys one or more of several deleterious messages:

1. The performance of the teacher being observed may be so flawed that even an uninformed observer can spot the flaws.
2. The experiences and perceptions of the neophyte are a sound basis for making professional judgments; that is, personal knowledge is given equal weight to professional knowledge.
3. Preferred teaching practices are matters of individual choice and private conviction.

Perhaps the most critical implication of a social-control perspective on teacher education is that teacher education faculties would themselves need to believe that the knowledge they have to transmit is compelling and that clear evidence of the mastery of this knowledge and the related skills is a prerequisite to full entry into the profession. Such a view would cause faculties to address the questions of performance standards in very different ways. For example, in schools of education where student teachers are given *A*, *B*, *C*, or *D* grades, the grading system implicitly causes one to raise the question, Is a performance that is good enough to pass a course also good enough to permit one to practice (i.e., to affect the lives of others)? I think not. It would seem that other assessments need to be developed to measure the individual's understanding of and commitment to the norms of the profession as well as the individual's acquisition of the skills and knowledge necessary to uphold those norms.

A Common Language

Whether by accident or design, occupations that are most effective in socializing neophytes to a shared set of standards, beliefs, and norms tend to concentrate their early training on the development of job-relevant descriptive and analytic language. Description and analysis constitute the

core of early training, certainly in medicine and law, and to a considerable extent in engineering and architecture. Medical students, for example, take courses in anatomy before pathology, and they learn to describe the human body and its functions before they are encouraged to ascertain whether the body is functioning properly. It is much later in the training that neophytes are exposed to comparative and evaluative frameworks.

One function of the early emphasis on description and analysis is to encourage neophytes to develop a job-relevant vocabulary. Such a vocabulary reinforces a sense of in-group identity. A second function is to demystify the phenomena upon which one will be expected to act and/or intervene.

The specific nature of the language used to describe, analyze, evaluate, and compare phenomena seems to vary among occupations. Occupations with well-developed and clearly articulated normative structures also have well-developed technical vocabularies, mastery of which is viewed as one of the more important learning tasks the neophyte confronts. Occupations with lesser developed normative structures and less clearly articulated performance expectations tend to rely more on jargon and inspirational polemic language to convey meaning. Although one person's jargon may be another's technical language and all occupations give some attention to inspiration and argumentation, occupations that are most effective in socializing new members and maintaining the integrity of a coherent set of occupational norms support their intentions by developing and codifying an occupationally relevant technical language. Like jargon, this technical language tends to separate insiders from outsiders, but unlike jargon, technical language facilitates the communication of shared descriptions and, thus, supports public analysis, data-based comparisons, and disciplined evaluation of conditions and performances.

Implications for Teacher Education

Numerous observers (e.g., Dreeben 1970; Lortie 1975) have noted that education lacks a shared technical language. On the other hand, others (e.g., Koerner 1963) have pointed out that education has a peculiar penchant for jargon.

Critics of teacher education suggest that the reason educators use so much jargon is that they have so little of substance to transmit. Thus, one must be cautious when recommending that teacher educators need to identify and codify a shared technical language, for nothing could be more harmful to the continuing development of the teaching occupation than the further elaboration of an already pretentious and jargon-ridden language. Yet, it remains that developing and codifying a shared technical language are critical to improving the effectiveness of teacher education programs, as well as the art and science of teaching.

While being cautious, teacher educators should not refrain from using technical language out of fear that they will be accused of using jargon. For example, in this monograph I have used terms such as *socialization* and *normative order*. Some critics undoubtedly will accuse me of using sociological jargon, and some people may confuse the term *socialization* with "drinking beer together." I believe, however, that the appropriate use of terms like *socialization* and *normative order* can facilitate description, analysis, and evaluation of the condition of teacher education.

The development of a common language about teaching requires first that teacher educators understand that the phenomenon they are attempting to describe is *teaching* rather than learning. The language derived from theories of learning (e.g., anticipatory set) is useful in helping one describe the goals of teaching, but such language is not useful in describing the process of teaching. Teaching is a public (i.e., observable) act, just as surgery and cross-examination during a trial are public acts. Public acts are admissible to public scrutiny. The task for educators con-

cerned with improving the quality of teacher education is to develop a language to describe what teachers do and how they do it.

Over the past 20 years, educational researchers have become increasingly proficient in describing classroom events. Though some of the language used in these descriptions (e.g., "with-it-ness" and "desists") have a jargonlike quality, the direction in which this research is headed offers considerable promise for the creation of a common language. Those who prepare teachers have an obligation to become familiar with this language and to identify those terms and concepts that illuminate rather than obfuscate. Even more, teacher educators have an obligation to becoming adept at describing classroom events and rendering these descriptions sufficiently precise so that they can communicate clearly to others what they have seen. Only when teacher educators commit themselves to developing such descriptions will teacher education have access to the shared language that it needs.

Another implication is that teacher educators need to develop and/or refine their theoretical understandings of human behavior in groups, collectivities, and aggregates, for such theoretical frameworks provide the basis for analyzing what has been described. The theoretical works of such sociologists as Goffman, Gerth, Mills, Merton, and Williams have at least as much place in a teacher education curriculum as do the works of learning theorists such as Skinner and Bruner. How children learn is one set of questions, and these are not trivial. How teachers teach classes of children, how they turn collectivities into smaller groups, or why they fail to do so are equally important questions. Leadership theory also is important to classroom teachers, because teachers, like supervisors, are managers of a work force, and like supervisors, teachers need to understand theories of management. As C. Wright Mills (1959) stated, "In this age of fact, it is not fact that they need. What is needed are clearer

and more lucid summations of what is going on in the world around us, and as a result, what is going on inside ourselves."

A final implication is that the curriculum of teacher education programs should emphasize, especially in the early stages, description and analysis and de-emphasize evaluative discussion at least until there is some assurance that the neophyte can accurately describe "what is going on here." During hundreds of hours of interviews with teachers, I have been struck with the observation that teachers are quick to render evaluative judgments (e.g., this was a good class, that was a bad class), but they are reluctant to describe the phenomena they are so ready to evaluate. In part, this reluctance must be because the teachers have little in their preparatory curricula that would encourage them to be descriptive as opposed to evaluative. Further, the analytic frames that they have, based as they are in theories of learning rather than of human behavior in organizations and groups, are largely irrelevant to analyzing what little they can describe. (For a more detailed discussion of the reasoning suggested here, see Schlechty 1976.)

Performance Visibility and Intensity of Communication

In addition to the characteristics of effective socialization systems already discussed, there are two additional matters of concern: (a) the visibility of performances and (b) the intensity of communication about the performances that are observed. The medical school adage of "watch one, do one, teach one" summarizes what we know about the effective transmission of knowledge of practice. Knowing what to look for (i.e., having the skill to describe in appropriate categories) is a necessary prerequisite and corequisite for full participation in a professionally oriented training program.

Assuming that this prerequisite exists, the neophyte must have the opportunity to observe; and in well-designed training programs, what one sees is not left up to chance. An intern in surgery, for example, is not as-

signed to observe "surgery" (though beginning teachers are assigned to observe classes); rather, he or she is assigned to watch particular types of surgery and particular surgical procedures. In teaching hospitals, patients are served *and* specific techniques are demonstrated. Further, it is understood that the skills required to demonstrate a technique may be different from the skills required to simply perform the technique. Surgeons or diagnosticians who demonstrate go to great pains to make the performance especially public (i.e., observable). They tell neophytes what they are going to do before they do it; they provide instruction in what to look for and how to look. Then they do or attempt to do what they said they would do. Subsequently, they hold postoperative or postprocedural conferences to discuss what they did or explain why they did not do what they thought they would do if that should occur. It is largely through these detailed clinical observations that the subtle knowledge of the profession is transmitted.

Watching is not enough, however. Doing is equally important. Again, in teaching hospitals neophytes are encouraged to do, but what they do is carefully observed, monitored, and evaluated by established members of the profession. Further, until the established members have some confidence in the neophytes' skill, the neophytes are not permitted to do anything that cannot be undone without harm. Low-risk, easily reversible procedures are the first clinical assignments given to medical students. Parallel situations can be found in large law firms.

In addition to being afforded the opportunity to practice, neophytes are expected to present (i.e., teach) what they have practiced. Such presentations serve not only to demystify practice and to render the practice public, but also to reinforce prior learnings and provide a highly visible evaluative setting. Making practice highly visible and subject to public criticism reinforces the norms of collegiality and evaluation, as well as as-

sures that both the experienced practitioner and the neophyte develop shared understandings of what the best practice is and why it is so.

Implications for Teacher Education

The most critical barrier to the effectiveness of the campus-based teacher educator as a norm transmitter resides in the fact that few teacher educators are in positions where they can give believable demonstrations, engage in intense communication about what they are demonstrating, carefully monitor neophytes, and cause neophytes to review carefully what they have practiced. In general, teacher educators understand this handicap and some strive mightily to overcome it through videotapes, simulations, and "practicing what they preach" in their college classrooms. The problem is that the situations described above, though preferable to nothing, are contrived and artificial. At best, they are context oblivious. For example, such activities may be able to demonstrate the importance of planning, but they are unlikely to demonstrate the limitations of planning. More important, demonstrations in isolated classes cannot take into account the history of the class as a sociological phenomenon. Where the class has been needs as much description as where the class is at present. What is happening today cannot be properly analyzed without knowing what happened yesterday and what one hopes will happen tomorrow. For the teacher, understanding the anatomy of the particular class is as important as understanding the anatomy of the human body is for the physician.

I see no way that teacher educators can be the powerful norm transmitters they should be until every teacher educator is responsible for at least one school class. In addition, until neophyte teachers and those who are assigned to transmit clinical knowledge to them have time to engage in intensive communication regarding acts observed and acts performed, it is unlikely that teacher educators will be a powerful force in the socialization of teachers.

One way to increase communication and feedback would be to assign campus-based teacher educators to schools on a regular basis. Another way would be to change the role of some who are now assigned to schools, so that they take on the additional role of teacher educator. Given that embedding teacher education in the structure of the schools will undoubtedly require committing more resources to the schools, it seems likely that a combination of alternatives is the most practical.

Recognizing that the above suggestion will be threatening to some campus-based teacher educators, I will make one further point. Intense observation and intense communication about what is observed seem to be the most powerful forms by which practical knowledge is transmitted. The present organization of teacher education and of schools makes it almost impossible to provide the kinds of intense observation and intense communication that are called for. Unless some schools are identified as centers of induction for new teachers and unless schools of education are prepared to commit resources to staffing these schools, it is unlikely that the conditions called for will exist. Furthermore, unless the professional education of teachers can be made more effective, it is unlikely that our society will continue to support teacher education institutions.

In conclusion, it seems to me that we know quite a bit about what is needed to improve the impact of teacher educators on teacher education. The question is, Will campus-based teacher educators be willing to participate in the type of institutional arrangements that are necessary to increase effectiveness? If they do not participate, will policymakers simply abandon the teacher education enterprise altogether, or will public schools be compelled to invent their own teacher education agencies and bypass institutions of higher education?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bruner, Jerome. 1986. *Actual minds, possible worlds*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Clark, David L. 1984. Better teachers for the year 2000: A proposal for the structural reform of teacher education. *Phi Delta Kappan* 66 (October):116–20.

Dreeben, Robert S. 1970. *The nature of teaching: Schools and the work of teachers*. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman.

Gerth, Hans, and C. Wright Mills. 1964. *Character and social structure: The psychology of social institutions*. San Diego, Calif.: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Goffman, Erving. 1959. *Presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Doubleday.

Holmes Group. 1986. *Tomorrow's teachers*. East Lansing, Mich.: Holmes Group.

House, Ernest R. 1980. *Evaluating with validity*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications.

Koerner, James. 1963. *Miseducation of American teaching*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Lortie, Dan. 1975. *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Merton, Robert K. 1968. *Social theory and social structure*. New York: Free Press.

Mills, C. Wright. 1959. *Sociological imagination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Parsons, Talcott. 1959. The school class as a social system: Some of its functions in American society. *Harvard Educational Review* 29:297–318.

Schlechty, Phillip C. 1985. A framework for evaluating induction into teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education* 36 (January–February):37–41.

_____. 1976. *Teaching and social behavior*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Schlechty, Phillip, and Victor Vance. 1983. Recruitment, selection, and retention: The shape of the teaching force. *Elementary School Journal* (March):469–87.

Schlechty, Phillip C., and Betty Lou Whitford. 1989. Systemic perspectives on beginning teacher programs. *Elementary School Journal* (March): 441-49.

Skinner, Burrhus Frederic. 1971. *Beyond freedom and dignity*. New York: Alfred Knopf.

Tyack, D., ed. 1967. *Turning points in American educational history*. Waltham, Mass.: Blaisdell Publishing Co.

Waller, Willard. [1932] 1967. *The sociology of teaching*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Williams, Robin. 1960. *American society: A sociological interpretation*. 2d ed. New York: Alfred Knopf.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
1 Dupont Circle, NW
Washington, DC 20036-2412
202-293-2450

75